

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Norfolk Division**

CENTRIPETAL NETWORKS, INC.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 2:18-cv-00094-EWH-LRL
)	
CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.)	
)	
Defendant.)	

**CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.’S NOTICE OF ADDITIONAL PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL
BOARD DECISIONS REGARDING THE ’856 PATENT IPR**

Defendant Cisco Systems, Inc. (“Cisco”) notifies the Court that, since the parties completed briefing as to Cisco’s Motion for a partial stay of the case (“Cisco’s Motion”) (Dkt. 665, 666, 668), the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”) issued a detailed 66 page decision Granting Institution of *Inter Partes* Review and Granting Cisco’s Motion for Joinder, attached hereto as Exhibit A (the “Decision”). Cisco brings this Decision to the Court’s attention because it: (a) notifies the Court of recent developments in the ’856 Patent IPR proceeding; (b) resolves arguments Centripetal made in opposition to Cisco’s Motion, and (c) provides further support for Cisco’s Motion.¹ This includes:

- granting Cisco’s request to be joined as a party to the ’856 Patent IPR (*see* discussion at pp. 54-62);

¹ For the sake of completeness, Cisco also informs the Court that the PTAB has issued the following additional decisions in the ’856 Patent IPR proceeding since briefing of Cisco’s Motion was completed: (1) December 6, 2022 decision denying Centripetal’s Request for Precedential Opinion Panel review; (2) January 4, 2023 decision denying Centripetal’s Request for Rehearing of Decision Granting Institution of *Inter Partes Review*; and (3) January 4, 2023 decision Granting Institution of *Inter Partes* Review and Granting Keysight Technologies, Inc.’s (“Keysight”) Motion for Joinder. If the Court would like any of these additional decisions, the parties will provide them to the Court.

- confirming that Cisco’s “joinder will not negatively impact the trial schedule of the [’856 Patent] IPR” (*see* p. 62), which is scheduled for a Final Written Decision by May 25, 2023;
- rejecting Centripetal’s arguments that Cisco’s joinder motion was “harassment” and “gamesmanship” (*see* pp. 40-42); and
- reiterating its prior preliminary finding that the merits of the ’856 Patent IPR seem “particularly strong” (*see* p. 14; *see also* pp. 15-33).

Dated: January 10, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
Of Counsel

Dabney J. Carr, IV, VSB No. 28679
**TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON
SANDERS LLP**
P. O. Box 1122
Richmond, Virginia 23218-1122
Telephone: (804) 697-1200
Facsimile: (804) 697-1339
dabney.carr@troutman.com

Charles K. Seyfarth, VSB No. 44530
O’HAGAN MEYER
411 East Franklin Street, Suite 500
Richmond, Virginia 23219
Telephone: (804) 403-7137
Facsimile: (804) 237-0250
cseyfarth@ohaganmeyer.com

Louis N. Jameson (admitted pro hac vice)
Matthew C. Gaudet (admitted pro hac vice)
John R. Gibson, VSB No. 72968
Alice E. Snedeker (admitted pro hac vice)
DUANE MORRIS, LLP
1075 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 1700
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3929
Telephone: (404) 253-6900
Facsimile: (404) 253-6901
wjameson@duanemorris.com
mcgaudet@duanemorris.com
jrgibson@duanemorris.com
jhforte@duanemorris.com

Joseph A. Powers (admitted pro hac vice)

DUANE MORRIS, LLP

30 South 17th Street

Philadelphia, PA 19103-4196

Telephone: (215) 979-1000

Facsimile: (215) 689-3797

japowers@duanemorris.com

John M. Baird, VSB No. 77827

Christopher J. Tyson, VSB No. 81553

DUANE MORRIS, LLP

505 9th Street, N.W., Suite 1000

Washington, DC 20004-2166

Telephone: (202) 776 7851

Facsimile: (202) 478 2620

cjtyson@duanemorris.com

Attorneys for Defendant

Cisco Systems, Inc.